7u

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,949	06/25/2003	Dirk Palenik	60027.0190USU1/BS# 030078	3137

39262	7590	09/18/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
WILSON, YOLANDA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/603,949	PALENIK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yolanda L. Wilson	2113

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 June 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-10,14-16 and 19-37_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _15 and 36_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-10,14,16,19-35 and 37_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Applicant is advised that should claim 7 be found allowable, claim 11 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other.as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

2.   Applicant is advised that should claim 14 be found allowable, claim 17 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1,2,4-7,9-11,19-22,25,26,28-30,33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Westell. As per claim 1, Westell discloses at the computer

system, utilizing a computer-implemented application to perform one or more checks on the computer system and communications device, wherein the computer-implemented application automatically runs during operation of the computer system to provide an on-going troubleshooting service; at the computer system, detecting from the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to operation of the communications device with the computer system; at the computer system, locating an error code corresponding to the problem detected from the one or more checks; and at the computer system, displaying the error code on pages 24-26, under the Diagnostics section; on page 15, under the Using Auto-Redirection section. The computer implemented application is the diagnostics pages which contains all of the tests to be performed on the computer system for the modem. The error code is the message displayed after the test is performed.

5.   As per claim 2, Westell discloses receiving a telephone call from a user of the computer system, wherein the user verbally provides the error code that is displayed; and providing verbal technical assistance to the user over the telephone call, wherein the technical assistance is based on the error code provided by the customer on pages 47-48, under the Troubleshooting section.

6.   As per claim 4, Westell discloses wherein the one or more checks includes checking operational parameters of the communications device on page 25, under the Diagnostics section.

7.   As per claim 5, Westell discloses wherein the communications device is a digital subscriber line modem on page 25, under the Diagnostics section.

8.   As per claim 6, Westell discloses at the computer system, locating a

troubleshooting tip corresponding to the problem detected from the one or more checks;

and at the computer system, displaying the troubleshooting tip on pages 44-48, under

the Troubleshooting section.

9.   As per claim 7, Westell discloses Westell discloses at the computer system,

utilizing a computer-implemented application to perform one or more checks on the

computer system and communications device wherein the computer-implemented

application automatically runs during operation of the computer system to provide an

on-going troubleshooting service; at the computer system, detecting from the one or

more checks whether there is a problem related to operation of the communications

device with the computer system; at the computer system, locating a troubleshooting tip

corresponding to the problem detected from the one or more checks; at the computer

system, displaying the located troubleshooting tip on pages 24-26, under the

Diagnostics section and on pages 44-48, under the Troubleshooting section; on page

15, under the Using Auto-Redirection section. The computer-implemented application is

the diagnostics pages that contain all of the tests to be performed on the computer

system for the modem. The error code is the message displayed after the test is

performed.

10.   As per claim 9, As per claim 4, Westell discloses wherein the one or more checks

includes checking operational parameters of the communications device on page 25,

under the Diagnostics section.

11.   As per claim 10, Westell discloses wherein the communications device is a digital

subscriber line modem on page 25, under the Diagnostics section.

12.   As per claim 11, Westell discloses Westell discloses at the computer system,

utilizing a computer-implemented application to perform one or more checks on the

computer system and communications device; at the computer system, detecting from

the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to operation of the

communications device with the computer system; at the computer system, locating a

troubleshooting tip corresponding to the problem detected from the one or more checks;

at the computer system, displaying the troubleshooting tip on pages 24-26, under the

Diagnostics section and on pages 44-48, under the Troubleshooting section; on page

15, under the Using Auto-Redirection section. The computer-implemented application is

the diagnostics pages that contain all of the tests to be performed on the computer

system for the modem. The error code is the message displayed after the test is

performed.

13.   As per claim 19, Westell discloses a display; a communications port; a

communications device coupled to the communications port and to an external network;

a processing device in communication with the display and the communication port,

wherein the processing device executes an application that performs one or more

checks based on the interconnection of the communications port with the

communications device and based on the interconnection of the communications device

with the external network to detect whether a problem is present, wherein the computer-

implemented application automatically runs during operation of the computer system to

provide an on-going troubleshooting service and wherein the application located

information corresponding to a detected problem and displays the located information

on pages 24-26, under the Diagnostics section and on pages 44-48, under the

Troubleshooting section; on page 15, under the Using Auto-Redirection section. The

computer-implemented application is the diagnostics pages that contain all of the tests

to be performed on the computer system for the modem. A display is needed to view

the information on the diagnostics pages.

14.   As per claim 20, Westell discloses wherein the located information is an error

code for the problem on pages 24-26 under the Diagnostics section.

15.   As per claim 21, Westell discloses wherein the located information is a

troubleshooting tip on pages 44-48 under the Troubleshooting section.

16.   As per claim 22, Westell discloses wherein the one or more checks includes

checking operational parameters of the communications device on pages 24-26 under

the Diagnostics section.

17.   As per claim 25, Westell discloses wherein the communications device is a digital

subscriber line modem on page 25 under the Diagnostics section.

18.   As per claim 26, Westell discloses at the computer system, utilizing a computer-

implemented application to perform one or more checks on the communications device,

the computer-implemented application automatically runs during operation of the

computer system to provide an on-going troubleshooting assistance, the one or more

checks being performed by querying a dynamic information store of the communications

device that is maintained by the communication device; at the computer system,

detecting from the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to operation

of the communications device; at the computer system locating information

corresponding to the problem detected from the one or more checks; and at the

computer system, displaying the information on pages 24-26, under the Diagnostics

section and on pages 44-48, under the Troubleshooting section; on page 15, under the

Using Auto-Redirection section. The computer-implemented application is the

diagnostics pages that contain all of the tests to be performed on the computer system

for the modem.

19.   As per claim 28, Westell discloses wherein the information is an error code on

pages 24-26 under the Diagnostics section. The error code is the message displayed.

20.   As per claim 29, Westell discloses wherein the information is a troubleshooting

tip on pages 44-48 under the Troubleshooting section.

21.   As per claim 30, Westell discloses wherein the communications device is a digital

subscriber line modem on page 25 under the Diagnostics section.

22.   As per claim 33, Westell discloses at the computer system, utilizing a computer-

implemented application to perform one or more checks on the communications device

and external network connected to the communications device wherein the computer-

implemented application automatically runs during operation of the computer system to

provide an on-going troubleshooting assistance; at the computer system, detecting from

the one or more checks whether there is a problem with the external network affecting

operation of the communications device; at the computer system, locating an error code

corresponding to the problem detected from the one or more checks; and at the

computer system, displaying the error code on pages 24-26, under the Diagnostics section and on pages 44-48, under the Troubleshooting section; on page 15, under the Using Auto-Redirection section. The computer-implemented application is the diagnostics pages that contain all of the tests to be performed on the computer system for the modem. The error code is the message displayed.

23.   Claims 14,17,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rango (USPN 6788705B1).

24.   As per claim 14, Rango discloses at the computer system, utilizing a computer-implemented application to perform one or more checks on the communications device; at the computer system, utilizing the computer-implemented application to detect from the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to operation of the communications device that a re-start may solve, wherein during the re-start the communications device maintains configuration data in a memory; and at the computer system, utilizing the computer-implemented application to initiate the re-start of the communications device upon detecting that there is a problem that the re-start may solve in column 3, lines 9-32; lines 35-50.

25.   As per claim 17, Rango discloses at the computer system, utilizing a computer-implemented application to perform one or more checks on the communications device; at the computer system, utilizing the computer-implemented application to detect from the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to operation of the communications device that a re-set may solve; and at the computer system, utilizing

the computer-implemented application re-set the communications device upon detecting

that there is a problem that the re-set may solve in column 3, lines 9-32; lines 35-50.

26.   As per claim 18, Rango discloses wherein utilizing the computer-implemented

application to detect form the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to

operation of the communications device that a re-set may solve comprises re-starting

the communications device and detecting wither the re-start solved the problem in

column 3, lines 9-32. The detection of whether the re-start solved the problem is when a

connection with the modem is attempted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

27.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

28.   Claims 3,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Westell in view of Li et al. (US Publication Number 20040078708A1).

29.   As per claims 3,8, Westell fails to explicitly state wherein the one or more checks

includes checking a connection between the computer system and the communications

device.

Li et al. discloses this limitation on page 2, paragraph 22, lines 10-15.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have the one or more checks include checking a

connection between the computer system and the communications device. A person of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the one or more checks

include checking a connection between the computer system and the communications

device because a determination as to whether or not a cable is properly connected to

the computer and modem is made.

30.   Claims 12,13,23,24,34,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Westell in view of Morgan et al. (USPN 6883118B2).

31.   As per claims 12,23,34 Westell fails to explicitly state wherein the one or more

checks includes checking for a response from a DNS server.

        Morgan et al. discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 48-52.

        Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have the one or more checks include checking for a

response from a DNS server. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to have the one or more checks include checking for a response from a DNS

server because sending a ping to the DNS server and detecting a response from the

DNS server determines whether or not the server is functioning properly.

32.   As per claims 13,24,35, Westell fails to explicitly state wherein the one or more

checks includes checking for a response from an email server.

        Morgan et al. discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 48-55.

        Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have the one or more checks include checking for a

response from an email server. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to have the one or more checks include checking for a response from an

email server because sending a ping to the email server and detecting a response from

the email server determines whether or not the server is functioning properly.

33.   Claims 16 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Rango in view of Westell.

34.   As per claim 16, Rango discloses wherein the communications device is a digital

subscriber line modem in column 3, lines 5-7.

        Rango fails to explicitly state the problem that a re-start may solve is a failure of a

transceiver to synchronize.

        Westell discloses this on page 25 under the Diagnostics section.

        Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have the problem that a re-start may solve be a failure

of the transceiver to synchronize. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to have the problem that a re-start may solve be a failure of the transceiver to

synchronize because failure of a modem transceiver is type of error that can occur

when trying to communicate with the ISP.

35.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westell

in view of Whatis.com.

36.   As per claim 27, Westell fails to explicitly state wherein the dynamic information

store is an XML page accessible from memory of the communications device.

        Whatis.com discloses this on page 1.

        Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have the dynamic information store be an XML page

accessible from memory of the communications device. A person of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to have the dynamic information store be an XML page

accessible from memory of the communications device because XML is a language that

is used to create a way for data to be displayed anywhere.

37.   Claims 31,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Westell in view of Kaffine et al. (USPN 6654914B1).

As per claim 31, Westell discloses at the computer system, utilizing a computer-

implements application to perform one or more checks on the computer system and

communications device wherein the computer-implemented application automatically

runs during operation of the computer system to provide an on-going troubleshooting

assistance; at the computer system, detecting from the one or more checks whether

there is a problem related to operation of the communications device with the computer

system; at the computer system, locating an error corresponding to the problem

detected from the one or more checks on pages 24-26, under the Diagnostics section

and on pages 44-48, under the Troubleshooting section on page 15, under the Using

Auto-Redirection section. The computer-implemented application is the diagnostics

pages that contain all of the tests to be performed on the computer system for the

modem. The error code is the message displayed.

Westell fails to explicitly state reporting the error code from the computer system

to a remotely located computer system.

Kaffine discloses this limitation in column 4, line 62 – column 5, line 6.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have reporting the error code from the computer system to a remotely located computer system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have reporting the error code from the computer system to a remotely located computer system because the user can obtain further help in trying to correct the errors that have occurred.

38.	As per claim 32, Westell fails to explicitly state wherein reporting the error code from the computer system comprises reporting the error code by transmitting the error code from the communications device when the operation of the communications device when the computer system allows.

Kaffine discloses this limitation in column 4, line 62 – column 5, line 6.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have reporting the error code from the computer system comprise reporting the error code by transmitting the error code from the communications device when the operation of the communications device when the computer system allows. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have reporting the error code from the computer system comprise reporting the error code by transmitting the error code from the communications device when the operation of the communications device when the computer system allows because the user cannot send any information until the modem is working again.

Response to Arguments

39.   Applicant's arguments filed 06/26/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues, under section III, on pages 13-14, "In contrast, Westell at least

does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a

computer. For example, Westell merely discloses using an auto-redirection feature to

display a web page that identifies a problem... In addition, in Westell, when a user is

trying to access a specific URL outside a local network, but has not established a PPP

connection, the user will be directed to a home page that indicates the session is

idle...When the user makes the connection, the user will be instantly redirected to the

URL that was initially requested...Westell's attempting to first access a web page and

then receiving an error does not disclose providing on-going troubleshooting services.

Consequently, in Westell, providing an on-going troubleshooting service during

operation of a computer is not disclosed. This is at least because, in Westell, the user

must first be trying to access a web page such that the auto-redirection feature will be

implemented. Westell does not anticipate the claimed invention because Westell at

least does not disclose 'utilizing a computer-implemented application to perform one or

more checks on the computer system and communications device, wherein the

computer-implemented application automatically runs during operation of the computer

system to provide an on-going troubleshooting service,' as recited by amended claim 1."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Auto-redirection is automatically run in

order to provide on-going troubleshooting service. It is available when an error occurs,

as well as the Diagnostics webpage that is used to test the modem and its various functions. There is always on-going troubleshooting whenever a need for checking components and when those components fail.

Applicant argues, under section IV, on pages 15-16, "In contrast, Rango at least does not disclose, during a restart, a communications device maintaining configuration data in a memory. For example, Rango merely discloses an operation for providing startup information over impaired lines during an initial installation or if communications are lost for a lengthy period of time... In addition, in Rango, a diagnostic payload is exchanged for use by an on site engineer to diagnose a problem, and manually reset DSL modem parameters and attempt a restart... Furthermore, Rango discloses that it may be useful for the DSL modem to attempt an automatic restart with new parameters... Consequently, because Rango discloses attempting an automatic restart with new parameters, Rango does not disclose a communication device maintaining configuration data during a re-start. Rango does not anticipate the claimed invention because Rango at least does not disclose 'utilizing the computer-implemented application to detect from the one or more checks whether there is a problem related to operation of the communications device that a re-start may solve, wherein during the re-start the communications device maintains configuration data in a memory,' as recited by amended Claim 14."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Rango discloses in column 3, lines 9-32 different ways in which a modem's errors are corrected. Specifically, column 3, lines 27-

29 disclose that modem parameters (configuration data) are reset then the modem is restarted, which anticipates the newly added limitation.

Applicant argues, under section V, on pages 17-18, "In contrast, Westell at least does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a computer...This is at least because...auto-redirection feature will be implemented"

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Please see the response to these arguments disclosed above by the Examiner.

Applicant also argues on page 18, "Furthermore, Li does not overcome Westell's deficiencies...Li does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a computer." Applicant also argues this point in the last paragraph beginning on page 18 and ending on page 19, under section V.

The Examiner would like to point out that Li is not used to reject this limitation. Please see the rejection of claims 3 and 8 above. Please see the response to the on-going troubleshooting service limitation arguments disclosed above by the Examiner.

Applicant argues on pages 20-22, under section VI, 'In contrast, Westell at least does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a computer...Furthermore, Morgan does not overcome Westell's deficiencies...Combining Westell with Morgan would not have lead to the claimed invention because Westell and Morgan...do not disclose...an on-going troubleshooting service,' as included in Claims 23-24, and 35."

The Examiner would like to point out that Morgan is not used to reject this limitation. Please see the rejection of claims 23,24, and 35 above. Please see the

response to the on-going troubleshooting service limitation arguments disclosed above by the Examiner.

Applicant argues on pages 22-24, under section VII, 'In contrast, Rango at least does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a computer...Furthermore, Westell does not overcome Westell's deficiencies...Combining Rango with Westell would not have lead to the claimed invention because Westell and Morgan...do not disclose...an on-going troubleshooting service,' as included in Claim 16."

The Examiner would like to point out that claim 14, which claim 16 is dependent upon does not disclose the on-going troubleshooting service limitation nor does claim 16; therefore, Applicant's arguments concerning claim 16 are moot.

Applicant argues on pages 26-28, under section VIII, 'In contrast, Westell at least does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a computer...Furthermore, Whatis.com does not overcome Westell's deficiencies...Combining Westell with Whatis.com would not have lead to the claimed invention because Westell and Morgan...do not disclose...an on-going troubleshooting service,' as included in Claim 27."

The Examiner would like to point out that Whatis.com is not used to reject this limitation. Please see the rejection of claim 27 above. Please see the response to the on-going troubleshooting service limitation arguments disclosed above by the Examiner.

Applicant argues on pages 28-30, under section IX, 'In contrast, Westell at least does not disclose providing an on-going troubleshooting service during operation of a

computer... Furthermore, Kaffine does not overcome Westell's deficiencies... Combining Westell with Kaffine would not have lead to the claimed invention because Westell and Morgan... do not disclose... an on-going troubleshooting service,' as included in Claim 31."

The Examiner would like to point out that Kaffine is not used to reject this limitation. Please see the rejection of claim 32 above. Please see the response to the on-going troubleshooting service limitation arguments disclosed above by the Examiner.

Applicant argues on page 31, under section X, "Claim 37 is allowable because none of the above cited references, either individually or in combination, at least do not discloses 'the communications device is a digital subscriber line modem and the problem that a re-start may solve is a failure of a transceiver to synchronize,' as recited by Claim 37."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Please see the rejection of above for claims 16 and 37.

Conclusion

40.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda L. Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                                Yolanda L Wilson
                                                Examiner
                                                Art Unit 2113

ylw